

**IN THE MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT**

COMPLETE TITLE OF CASE

STATE OF MISSOURI,

Respondent,

v.

CLINTON EUGENE WOODROME,

Appellant.

DOCKET NUMBER WD75460

**MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT**

DATE: September 10, 2013

APPEAL FROM

The Circuit Court of Bates County, Missouri
The Honorable James K. Journey, Judge

JUDGES

Division Three: Hardwick, P.J., and Pfeiffer and Martin, JJ.

CONCURRING.

ATTORNEYS

Chris Koster, Attorney General
Jessica P. Meredith, Assistant Attorney General
Jefferson City, MO

Attorneys for Respondent,

Erika R. Eliason, Assistant Public Defender
Columbia, MO

Attorney for Appellant.



MISSOURI APPELLATE COURT OPINION SUMMARY MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS, WESTERN DISTRICT

STATE OF MISSOURI,)
)
Respondent,)
v.) **OPINION FILED:**
) **September 10, 2013**
CLINTON EUGENE WOODROME,)
)
Appellant.)

WD75460

Bates County

Before Division Three Judges: Lisa White Hardwick, Presiding Judge, and Mark D. Pfeiffer and Cynthia L. Martin, Judges

Clinton Woodrome ("Woodrome") appeals the judgment of the Circuit Court of Bates County, Missouri ("trial court"), convicting him, after a jury trial, of three counts of receiving stolen property, § 570.080. On appeal, Woodrome claims that the trial court erred in denying his motion to suppress evidence and then admitting evidence obtained in what Woodrome argues was an unlawful search conducted without a search warrant and absent exigent circumstances.

AFFIRMED.

Division Three holds:

Officers had arrest warrants for both Woodrome and his friend, who lived with Woodrome on the same lot that Woodrome rented in an RV park. Because the officers were lawfully on the lot to arrest Woodrome and his friend, they could lawfully knock on the door to the RV trailer on the lot to see whether the men were there. In so doing, the officers could see the VIN number to the RV trailer in plain view and could run the number to determine whether the RV trailer had been stolen.

Moreover, Woodrome had no reasonable expectation of privacy in the lot he rented at the RV park. Owners or renters of bare lots have no expectation of privacy in them; instead, a reasonable expectation of privacy in an RV lot could only come from its being the dwelling place of an individual, and then, only if the individual's expectation of privacy in the dwelling were

one that society accepted as reasonable. Because Woodrome's dwelling was the stolen RV trailer, he had no reasonable expectation of privacy in the dwelling, and thus no reasonable expectation of privacy in the "curtilage" or area surrounding the dwelling. Accordingly, Woodrome's Fourth Amendment rights were not violated, and the trial court properly denied his motion to suppress evidence.

Opinion by: Mark D. Pfeiffer, Judge

September 10, 2013

* * * * *

THIS SUMMARY IS UNOFFICIAL AND SHOULD NOT BE QUOTED OR CITED.